arXiv:0905.2385v1 [math.RA] 14 May 2009

The identities and the central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field

C. Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin

May 14, 2009

Abstract

We describe the T-ideal of identities and the T-space of central polynomials for the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field.

1 Introduction

In 1987, one of the fundamental results in the theory of PI-algebras was obtained by A. R. Kemer ([11]). Kemer proved that every system of identities in an associative algebra over a field of characteristic zero is finitely based, which provided a positive answer to a question raised by W. Specht ([13]) in 1950. Shortly after Kemer's result appeared, A. V. Grishin introduced the concept of T-space ([7], [8]); a vector subspace of an algebra that is closed under the natural action of the monoid T of all endomorphisms of the algebra. As shown by Grishin and V. V. Shchigolev in the influential survey paper [9], T-spaces have important applications in the theory of PI-algebras and in the problem of the finite-basedness of T-ideals.

T-ideals arise in the study of the identities of an associative algebra, and very closely related to the T-ideal of identities of an associative algebra is the T-space of central polynomials of an associative algebra; the set of all elements that map into the centre under every algebra homomorphism from the free associative algebra into the given associative algebra. A. Y. Belov, writing in [1], observed that if one regards PI-theory as a kind of viewpoint for noncommutative algebraic geometry, then the Grassmann algebra serves as one of the most important examples of new objects that are analogues of prime algebras. In this context, it seemed natural to investigate the T-space of central polynomials of the Grassmann algebra, with a view to determining whether or not this T-space is Spechtian.

In [3] and [4], we identified the T-space of central polynomials of the finite and the infinite dimensional, unitary and nonunitary Grassmann algebras over a field of arbitrary characteristic, although only for an infinite field in the case of the unitary Grassmann algebra. In these earlier works, we were able to utilize descriptions of the T-ideal of identities for the corresponding Grassmann algebras due to Chiripov and Siderov [2], Giambruno and Koshlukov [6], and Stojanova-Venkova [14], but for the unitary Grassmann algebras over a finite field, the T-ideal of identities was not yet known. A. Regev had initiated a study of the identities of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field in [12], but a complete description of the identities for that case was not forthcoming.

The purpose of this paper is to present a complete description of the T-ideal of the identities of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field, thus completing work that was begun by Regev [12] in 1991. We then use this information to provide a complete description of the T-space of central polynomials in this case as well.

In a subsequent article (see [5]), we establish that if $p > 2$ and k is an arbitrary field of characteristic p, then neither the T-space of central polynomials of the unitary nor the nonunitary infinite dimensionalGrassmann algebra over k is finitely based.

2 Preliminaries

Let k be a finite field of characteristic p and size q, and let X be a countably infinite set, say $X = \{ x_i \mid i \geq 1 \}$. Then $k_0\langle X\rangle$ denotes the free (nonunitary) associative k-algebra over X, while $k_1\langle X\rangle$ denotes the free unitary associative k-algebra over X.

Let A denote any associative k-algebra. Any linear subspace of A that is invariant under the natural action of the monoid T of all algebra endomorphisms of A is called a T-space of A, and if a T-space happens to also be an ideal of H, then it is called a T-ideal of A. For $B \subseteq A$, the smallest T-space containing B shall be denoted by B^S, while the smallest T-ideal of A that contains B shall be denoted by B^T. In this article, we shall deal only with T-spaces and T-ideals of $k_0\langle X\rangle$ and $k_1\langle X\rangle$.

A nonzero element $f \in k_0\langle X\rangle$ is called an *identity* of A if f is in the kernel of every k-algebra homomorphism from $k_0\langle X\rangle$ to A (every unitary k-algebra homomorphism from $k_1\langle X\rangle$ if A is unitary). The set consisting of 0 and all identities of A is a T-ideal of $k_0\langle X\rangle$ (and of $k_1\langle X\rangle$ if A is unitary), denoted by $T(A)$. An element $f \in k_0\langle X\rangle$ is called a *central polynomial* of A if $f \notin T(A)$ and the image of f under any k-algebra homomorphism from $k_0\langle X\rangle$ (unitary k-algebra homomorphism from $k_1\langle X\rangle$ if H is unitary) to A belongs to C_A, the centre of A. The T-space of $k_0\langle X\rangle$ (or of $k_1\langle X\rangle$ if A is unitary) that is generated by the set of all central polynomials of A is denoted by $CP(A)$.

Let G denote the (countably) infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over k, so there exist $e_i \in G$, $i \geq 1$, such that for all i and j, $e_ie_j = -e_je_i$, $e_i^2 = 0$, and $\mathcal{B} = \{ e_{i_1}e_{i_2}\cdots e_{i_n} \mid n \geq 1, i_1 < i_2 < \cdots i_n \}$, together with 1, forms a linear basis for G. Let E denote the set $\{ e_i \mid i \geq 1 \}$. The subalgebra of G with linear basis $\mathcal{B}$ is the infinite dimensional nonunitary Grassmann algebra over k, and is denoted by G_0. Then for any positive integer m, the unitary subalgebra of G that is generated by $\{\, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m \,\}$, is denoted by $G(m)$, while the nonunitary subalgebra of G_0 that is generated by the same set is denoted by $G_0(m)$.

It is well known that $T^{(3)}$, the T-ideal of $k_1\langle X\rangle$ generated by $[[x_1, x_2], x_3]$, is contained in $T(G)$. For convenience, we shall write $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ for $[[x_1, x_2], x_3]$.

In that paper, Regev showed that $\{\, [x, y, z], x^{qp} - x^p \,\}^T \subseteq T(G)$. By working modulo the T-ideal $\{\, [x, y, z], x^{qp} - x^p \,\}^T$, we are able to establish that in fact, equality holds when $p > 2$, while for $p = 2$, $T(G) = \{\, [x_1, x_2], x_1^{2q} - x^2 \,\}^T$. Then, with full knowledge of $T(G)$ in hand, we are able to obtain the T-space of central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field (the one outstanding case).

Evidently (since all Grassmann algebras over a field of characteristic 2 are commutative), $CP(G) = k_1\langle X\rangle$ if $p = 2$, and we show that for $p > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} CP(G) &= T(G) + \{\, [x_1, x_2], x_1^p \,\}^S + \{\, x_1^p \prod_{i=1}^{k} [x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}] x_{2i}^{p-1} x_{2i+1}^{p-1} \mid k \geq 1 \,\}^S \\ &= \{\, [x_1, x_2, x_3]x_4, x_1(x_2^{qp} - x_2^p) \,\}^S + \{\, [x_1, x_2], x_1^p \,\}^S \\ &\qquad + \{\, x_1^p \prod_{i=1}^{k} [x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}] x_{2i}^{p-1} x_{2i+1}^{p-1} \mid k \geq 1 \,\}\big)^S. \end{aligned}$$

We complete this section with a brief description of results from the literature that will be required in this work. To begin with, the following lemma summarizes discussion found in Chiripov and Siderov [2]. A product term $e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \cdots e_{i_n}$ in G_0 is said to be *even* if n is even, otherwise the product term is said to be *odd*. $u \in G_0$ is said to be *even* if u is a linear combination of even product terms, while u is said to be *odd* if u is a linear combination of odd product terms. Let C denote the set of all even elements of G_0, and let H denote the set of all odd elements of G_0. Note that C and H are k-linear subspaces of G_0, and C is closed under multiplication, $H^2 \subseteq C$, and $CH = HC \subseteq H$. Evidently, $G_0 = C \oplus H$ as k-vector spaces.

Lemma 2.1

(i) $C_{G_0} = C$, and $C_G = k \oplus C$.

(ii) For $h, u \in H$, $hu = -uh$. In particular, $h^2 = 0$ (since $p > 2$).

(iii) Let $g \in G_0$, so there exist (unique) $c \in C$ and $h \in H$ such that $g = c + h$. For any positive integer n, $g^n = c^n + nc^{n-1}h$.

(iv) For $g \in G_0$, $g^p = 0$, and for any $\alpha \in k$, $(\alpha + g)^p = \alpha^p$.

(v) Let $c_1, c_2 \in C$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$, and set $g_1 = c_1 + h_1$, $g_2 = c_2 + h_2$. Then for any nonnegative integers m_1, m_2, $[g_1, g_2]g_1^{m_1} g_2^{m_2} = 2c_1^{m_1} c_2^{m_2} h_1 h_2$ (where g_i^0 and c_i^0 are understood to mean that the factors g_i^0 and c_i^0 are omitted).

(vi) Let $u \in G_0$. Then $u^{n+1} = 0$, where n is the number of distinct basic product terms in the expression for u as a linear combination of elements of $\mathcal{B}$.

Definition 2.1 *Let SS denote the set of all elements of the form*

(i) $\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, *or*

(ii) $\prod_{r=1}^{s}[x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, *or*

(iii) $\left(\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}\right) \prod_{r=1}^{s}[x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$,

where $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots j_{2s}$, $\beta_i \geq 0$ for all i, $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_t$, $\{ i_1, \ldots, i_r \} \cap \{ j_1, \ldots, j_{2s} \} = \varnothing$, and $\alpha_i \geq 1$ for all i.

Let $u \in SS$. If u is of the form (i), then the beginning of u, beg(u), is $\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, the end of u, end(u), is empty, the length of the beginning of u, lbeg(u), is equal to t and the length of the end of u, lend(u), is 0. If u is of the form (ii), then we say that beg(u), the beginning of u, is empty, end(u), the end of u, is $\prod_{r=1}^{s}[x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, and lbeg($u$) $= 0$ and lend(u) $= s$. If u is of the form (iii), then we say that beg(u), the beginning of u, is $\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, end($u$), the end of u, is $\prod_{r=1}^{s}[x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, and lbeg($u$) $= t$ and lend(u) $= s$.

In [2], Siderov introduced a total order on the set SS which was useful in his work on the identities of the infinite dimensional nonunitary Grassmann algebra.

Definition 2.2 (Siderov's ordering) *For $u, v \in SS$, we say that $u > v$ if one of the following requirements holds.*

(i) $\deg u > \deg v$.

(ii) $\deg u = \deg v$ *but lend(u) < lend(v).*

(iii) $\deg u = \deg v$ *and lend(u) = lend(v), but there exists $i \geq 1$ such that* $\deg_{x_i} u > \deg_{x_i} v$ *and for each $j < i$,* $\deg_{x_j} u = \deg_{x_j} v$.

(iv) $\deg u = \deg v$, *lend(u) = lend(v) and for each $i \geq 1$,* $\deg_{x_i} u = \deg_{x_i} v$, *and there exists $j \geq 1$ such that x_j appears in beg(u) and in end(v), and for each $k > j$, x_k appears in beg(u) if and only if x_k appears in beg(v).*

3 The T-ideal of identities of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field

Lemma 3.1 ([12], Lemma 1.5) $x^{qp} - x^p \in T(G)$. *Moreover, if $f(x)$ is a one-variable identity of G, then $x^{qp} - x^p$ divides f in $k_1\langle X \rangle$.*

Definition 3.1 *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} BSS = \{\, u \in SS \mid & \textit{for each } i,\ \deg_{x_i}(u) < p \textit{ if } x_i \textit{ appears in } beg(u) \\ & \textit{or } \deg_{x_i}(u) \le p \textit{ if } x_i \textit{ appears in } end(u) \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.2 *For* $u = e_{i_1}e_{i_2}\cdots e_{i_n} \in \mathcal{B}$, *let* $s(u) = \{\, e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \ldots, e_{i_n} \,\}$ *and* $wt(u) = |s(u)|$, *while* $s(1) = \varnothing$ *and* $wt(1) = 0$. *We call* $s(u)$ *and* $wt(u)$ *the support and weight of* u, *respectively. Now for any* $g \in G$, $g \neq 0$, $g = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i g_i$ *with* $a_i \in k^* = k - \{\, 0 \,\}$ *and* $g_i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \{\, 1 \,\}$. *Let* $s(g) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} s(g_i)$, $wt(g) = \max\{\, wt(g_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \,\}$, *and* $dom(g) = \sum_{wt(g_i)=wt(g)} a_i g_i$, *while we define* $s(0) = \varnothing$ *and* $wt(0) = 0$. *We call* $s(g)$ *the support of* g, $wt(g)$ *the weight of* g, *and* $dom(g)$ *the dominant part of* g. *Note that if* $s(g_1) \cap s(g_2) = \varnothing$, *then* $dom(g_1g_2) = dom(g_1)dom(g_2)$ *and* $wt(g_1g_2) = wt(g_1) + wt(g_2)$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let* n *and* γ *be positive integers and let* $\lambda \in k$. *Then the following hold.*

(i)

$$dom((\lambda + \textstyle\sum_{\epsilon=1}^{n} e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{\gamma}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma!}{(\gamma-n)!}\lambda^{\gamma-n}\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2n} e_{\epsilon} & \textit{if } \gamma \ge n \\ \gamma! \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq J_n \\ |J|=\gamma}} \prod_{j \in J} e_{2j-1}e_{2j} & \textit{if } \gamma < n. \end{cases}$$

(ii)

$$dom((\lambda + e_{2n+1} + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{n} e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{\gamma}) =$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\gamma!}{(\gamma-n)!}\lambda^{\gamma-n}\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2n+1} e_{\epsilon} & \textit{if } \gamma > n \\ \gamma! \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq J_n \\ |J|=\gamma}} \prod_{j \in J} e_{2j-1}e_{2j} & \textit{if } \gamma \le n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For (i), note that $\mathrm{dom}(\lambda + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{n} e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{\gamma}$ is equal to

$$\mathrm{dom}(\sum_{\substack{c_0+c_1+\cdots+c_n=\gamma \\ c_0,\, c_1, \ldots,\, c_n \ge 0}} \binom{\gamma}{c_0,\ c_1,\ \ldots,\ c_n} \lambda^{c_0} \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{n} (e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{c_\epsilon}).$$

The dominant part will therefore be obtained by setting as many as possible of the c_i values to 1, $i \ge 1$ (if $c_i \ge 2$ when $i \ge 1$, the summand will be 0). The result is as shown in (i).

For (ii), note that $\mathrm{dom}(\lambda + e_{2n+1} + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{n} e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{\gamma})$ is equal to

$$\mathrm{dom}(\sum_{\substack{c_0+c_{n+1}+c_1+\cdots+c_n=\gamma \\ c_0,\, c_{n+1},\, c_1, \ldots,\, c_n \ge 0}} \binom{\gamma}{c_0,\ c_{n+1},\ c_1,\ \ldots,\ c_n} \lambda^{c_0} e_{2n+1}^{c_{n+1}} \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{n} (e_{2\epsilon-1}e_{2\epsilon})^{c_\epsilon}).$$

The dominant part will therefore be obtained by setting as many as possible of the c_i values to 1, $i \ge 1$ (if $c_i \ge 2$ when $i \ge 1$, the summand will be 0). The result is as shown in (ii). ∎

Let $proj_k : G \to k$ denote the k-algebra homomorphism that is determined by mapping 1 to 1, and e_i to 0.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $u \in BSS$, and set $m = 2\deg(u) - 2lend(u)$. For each $i \geq 1$, let $\lambda_i \in k$. Then there exists a homomorphism $\varphi\colon k_1\langle X\rangle \to G(m)$ such that the following hold.*

(i) For each index i, $proj_k(\varphi(x_i)) = \lambda_i$.

(ii) $$dom(\varphi(u)) = 2^{lend(u)} \prod_{x \text{ in } beg(u)} \deg_x(u)\,! \prod_{x \text{ in } end(u)} (\deg_x(u) - 1)\,! \prod_{i=1}^{m} e_i.$$

(iii) For any $v \in BSS$ with $u > v$, $m = wt(\varphi(u)) > wt(\varphi(v))$.

Proof. The homomorphism φ is determined by the following assignments. First, any variable $x_i \in X$ that does not appear in u is mapped to λ_i. Then for any variable x that appears in $beg(u)$, choose an index offset $N = N_x$, $E_x = \{\, e_{N+\epsilon} \mid \epsilon = 1, 2, \ldots, 2\deg_x(u) \,\} \subseteq E$, and map x to $\lambda_x + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{\deg_x(u)} e_{N+2\epsilon-1}e_{N+2\epsilon}$. Finally, for any variable x that appears in $end(u)$, choose an index offset $N = N_x$, $E_x = \{\, e_{N+\epsilon} \mid \epsilon = 1, 2, \ldots, 2\deg_x(u) - 1 \,\} \subseteq E$, and map x to $\lambda_x + e_{N+2\deg_x(u)-1} + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{\deg_x(u)-1} e_{N+2\epsilon-1}e_{N+2\epsilon}$. Note that (i) is satisfied by this assignment. The offsets N_x are chosen so that $x \neq y$ implies that $E_x \cap E_y = \varnothing$ and $\bigcup_{x \text{ appears in } u} E_x = \{\, e_i \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \,\}$.

Recall that for $g_1, g_2 \in G$, $\mathrm{dom}(g_1g_2) = \mathrm{dom}(g_1)\mathrm{dom}(g_2)$ if $s(g_1) \cap s(g_2) = \varnothing$. In particular, since $u \in BSS$ (where the cases of u with empty beginning or empty end are just simplifications of the following argument), u is of the form

$$\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \prod_{r=1}^{s} [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{j_{2r}}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}},$$

where for each $r = 1, 2, \ldots, t$, $1 \leq \alpha_r \leq p - 1$ and for each $r = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s$, $0 \leq \beta_r \leq p$, so $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi(u))$ will be the product of $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi(x_{i_r})^{\alpha_r}))$, $r = 1, 2, \ldots, t$, and

$$\mathrm{dom}([\varphi(x_{j_{2r-1}}), \varphi(x_{j_{2r}})]\varphi(x_{j_{2r-1}})^{\beta_{2r-1}}\varphi(x_{j_{2r}})^{\beta_{2r}})$$

for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, s$.

We now apply Lemma 3.2 to evaluate the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$, where for convenience, we shall let N_i denote N_x where $x = x_i$. Note that for $g = \lambda + c + h$, where $\lambda \in k$, $c \in C$ and $h \in H$, we have for any $g_1 \in G$ that $[g, g_1]g^r = [h, g_1](\lambda + c)^r$. If $s(g) \cap s(g_1) = \varnothing$, then g's contribution to the dominant part is $\mathrm{dom}(h(\lambda + c)^r)$. We now apply Lemma 3.2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{dom}(\varphi(u)) &= \prod_{r=1}^{t} \left(\alpha_r! \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\alpha_r} e_{N_{i_r}+\epsilon} \right) 2^{lend(u)} \\
&\qquad \prod_{r=1}^{s} \left(\beta_{2r-1}! \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\beta_{2r-1}+1} e_{N_{j_{2r-1}}+\epsilon} \; \beta_{2r}! \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\beta_{2r}+1} e_{N_{j_{2r}}+\epsilon} \right) \\
&= 2^{lend(u)} \prod_{r=1}^{t} \alpha_r! \prod_{r=1}^{2s} \beta_r! \quad \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{m} e_\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and so (ii) holds.

Finally, suppose that $v \in BSS$, and that $u > v$. Note that $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u)) = m > 0$. If a variable appears in $beg(u)$ and in $end(v)$, then $\varphi(v) = 0$ and so $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(v)) = 0$. Thus we may assume that every variable that appears in $beg(u)$ and in v then appears in $beg(v)$. Since conditions (ii) and (iv) of the definition of the Siderov ordering imply that there exists a variable that appears in $beg(u)$ and in $end(v)$, we see that $u > v$ must hold by virtue of conditions (i) or (iii) of the definition. We now calculate the weight of the dominant part of $\varphi(v)$. First, observe that the contribution to the weight of the dominant part of $\varphi(v)$ of $x \in X$ that appears in v but not in u is 0. Next, by Lemma 3.2, the weight of the contribution of $x \in X$ that appears in both u and v is $\min\{\, 2\deg_x(u), 2\deg_x(v)\,\}$ if x appears in $beg(u)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)$), while it is $\min\{\, 2\deg_x(u)-1, 2\deg_x(v)-1\,\}$ if x appears in $end(u)$ and $end(v)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)-1$), and it is $\min\{\, 2\deg_x(u)-1, 2\deg_x(v)\,\}$ if x appears in $end(u)$ and in $beg(v)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)$). Now, either of conditions (i) or (iii) implies that there is a variable x such that $\deg_x(u) > \deg_x(v) \geq 0$, so it follows that $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u)) > \mathrm{wt}(\varphi(v))$. ■

The following result is well known.

Lemma 3.3 $[x_1^p, x_2] \in T^{(3)}$.

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $f \in k_1\langle X\rangle$ *be of the form* $f = \sum_{r=1}^{t} \lambda_r u_r$*, where for each* $r = 1, 2, \ldots, t$*,* $u_r \in SS$*,* $lend(u_r) = 0$*, and for each* $x \in X$ *that appears in* u_r*,* $\deg_x(u_r) < q$*. If* $f \in T(k)$*, then* $f = 0$*.*

Proof. The proof will be by induction on n, the number of variables that appear in f. If $f \in T(k)$ is a single variable polynomial, then f is divisible by $x^q - x$, and thus $f = 0$ by degree considerations. Suppose that $n \geq 1$ is such that the assertion holds and consider an $n+1$ variable polynomial $f \in T(k)$ of the required form. Suppose that $f \neq 0$. We may assume that the variables of f are $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}$. Let $m = \deg_{x_{n+1}}(f)$. Then we may write $f = \sum_{r=1}^{m} f_r x_{n+1}^r$, where for each r, f_r is a linear combination of elements of SS with empty end in which each variable has degree less than q, but on only the n variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, and $f_m \neq 0$. It follows from the induction hypothesis that f_m is not an identity, and so there are $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n \in k$ such that $f_m(g_1, \ldots, g_n) \neq 0$. But then $f(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n, x)$ is a one variable identity of degree $m < q$, which implies that $f(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n, x)$ is the zero polynomial. In particular, $f_m(g_1, \ldots, g_n) = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus $f = 0$, as required, and the result follows by induction. ■

Definition 3.3 $f \in k_1\langle X\rangle$ *shall be called a* p-polynomial *if either* $f \in k$ *or else* $f = \sum_{r=1}^{t} \lambda_r u_r$*, where for each* $r = 1, 2, \ldots, t$*,* $u_r \in SS$*,* $lend(u_r) = 0$*, and for each* $x \in X$ *that appears in* u_r*,* $\deg_x(u_r) < qp$ *and* $\deg_x(u_r) \equiv 0 \ (mod p)$*.*

Corollary 3.1 *If* $f \in T(G)$ *is a p-polynomial, then* $f = 0$*.*

Proof. If $f \in k$, then f is obviously 0, so consider $f \notin k$. Let $v_i \in SS$ be such that $u_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = v_i(x_1^p, x_2^p, \dots, x_m^p)$. Since the Frobenius map is injective, and thus, since k is finite, surjective, it follows that $\sum_{r=1}^{t} \lambda_r v_r \in T(k)$ and for each r, $lend(v_r) = 0$ and for each $x \in X$ that appears in v_r, $\deg_x(v_r) < q$. By Lemma 3.4, $f = 0$. ■

Theorem 3.1 *If* $p = 2$, *then* $T(G) = \{ x_1^2 - x_1^{2q}, [x_1, x_2] \}^T$, *otherwise* $T(G) = \{ x_1^{qp} - x_1^p, [x_1, x_2, x_3] \}^T$.

Proof.
If $p = 2$, let $U = \{ x_1^{2q} - x_1^2, [x_1, x_2] \}^T$, while if $p > 2$, let $U = \{ x_1^{qp} - x_1^p, [x_1, x_2, x_3] \}^T$. By Lemma 3.1, $x_1^{qp} - x_1^p \in T(G)$, and certainly $[x_1, x_2, x_3] \in T(G)$, while if $p = 2$, then G is commutative and so $[x_1, x_2] \in T(G)$ in this case. Thus $U \subseteq T(G)$. Note that $T^{(3)} \subseteq \{ [x_1, x_2] \}^T$, so $T^{(3)} \subseteq U$ in every case. Suppose that $U \neq T(G)$, and let $f \in T(G) - U$. Since $x_1^{qp} - x_1^p \in U$, we may assume that for any variable x, if x^γ is a factor of a summand of f, then $\gamma < qp$. As well, since $T^{(3)} \subseteq U$, we may assume that $f = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_i$ for $\lambda_i \in k^*$ and $v_i \in SS$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $T^{(3)} \subseteq U$, if $x \in X$ and x^γ is a factor of v_i, with $\gamma = p\delta + \epsilon$ where $0 \leq \epsilon < p$, then we may move $x^{p\delta}$ to the front of v_i. Thus we may assume that $f = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i u_i$, where for each i, $f_i \neq 0$ is of the form described in Corollary 3.1, and either $u_1 = 1$ or else $u_i \in BSS$. By Corollary 3.1, not every u_i is equal to 1. Let us represent the sum of the terms for which $u_i = 1$ by f_0, and assume that the other terms have been labelled so that $f = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} f_i u_i$, where $u_1 > u_2 > \cdots > u_t$. By Corollary 3.1, since $f_1 \neq 0$, $f_1 \notin T(G)$. Suppose that the variables appearing in f_1 are $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_w}$. Then there exist $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_w \in G$ such that $f_1(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_w) \neq 0$. Now, for any $g \in G$, $g^p = \lambda^p$, where $\lambda \in k$, $c \in C$, and $h \in H$ are such that $g = \lambda + c + h$. Since each variable of f_1 has degree a multiple of p, it follows that there are $\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, \dots, \lambda_{i_w} \in k$ such that $f_1(\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, \dots, \lambda_{i_w}) \neq 0$. For any $i \geq 1$, $i \notin \{ i_1, i_2, \dots, i_w \}$, let $\lambda_i = 0$. Now apply Proposition 3.1 to obtain a homomorphism $\varphi\colon k_1\langle X\rangle \to G$ such that $\varphi(f_1) = f_1(\lambda_{i_1}, \dots, \lambda_{i_w}) \neq 0$ and $\varphi(u_1) \neq 0$, while $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u_1)) > \mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u_i))$ for all $i > 1$. Since $\varphi(f_0) \in k$, it follows that $\varphi(f) \neq 0$, contradicting the fact that $f \in T(G)$. Thus $T(G) - U = \varnothing$, and so $T(G) \subseteq U$, as required. ■

4 The central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field

Recall that the T-space of $k_1\langle X\rangle$ that is generated by the set of all central polynomials of G is denoted by $CP(G)$. By Lemma 2.1 (iv), $g^p \in C_G$ for all $g \in G$, and so $x^p \in CP(G)$.

When $p = 2$, then G is commutative and so $CP(G) = k_1\langle X\rangle$. Thus for the sequel, we assume that $p > 2$.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $u \in BSS$ be such that $beg(u) > 0$, and let t be such that x_t appears in $beg(u)$. Set $m = 2\deg(u) - 2lend(u) - 1$, and for each $i \geq 1$, let $\lambda_i \in k$. Then there exists a homomorphism $\varphi\colon k_1\langle X\rangle \to G(m)$ such that the following hold.*

(i) For each index i, $proj_k(\varphi(x_i)) = \lambda_i$.

(ii) $dom(\varphi(u)) = \lambda_t 2^{lend(u)} \prod_{x \text{ in } beg(u)} \deg_x(u)! \prod_{x \text{ in } end(u)} (\deg_x(u) - 1)! \prod_{i=1}^{m} e_i$.

(iii) For any $v \in BSS$ with $u > v$ and either x_t appears in $beg(v)$ or else x_t appears with degree p in $end(v)$, $m = wt(\varphi(u)) > wt(\varphi(v))$.

Proof.

The homomorphism φ is determined by the following assignments. First, any variable $x_i \in X$ that does not appear in u is mapped to λ_i. Then choose an index offset N_t, let $\alpha = \deg_{x_t}(u)$, set $E_t = \{\, e_{N+\epsilon} \mid \epsilon = 1, 2, \dots, 2\alpha - 1 \,\} \subseteq E$, and map x_t to $\lambda_t + e_{N+2\alpha-1} + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{\alpha-1} e_{N+2\epsilon-1}e_{N+2\epsilon}$. Next, for any variable $x \neq x_t$ that appears in $beg(u)$, choose an index offset $N = N_x$, let $E_x = \{\, e_{N+\epsilon} \mid \epsilon = 1, 2, \dots, 2\deg_x(u) \,\} \subseteq E$, and map x to $\lambda_x + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{\deg_x(u)} e_{N+2\epsilon-1}e_{N+2\epsilon}$. Finally, for any variable x that appears in $end(u)$, choose an index offset $N = N_x$, $E_x = \{\, e_{N+\epsilon} \mid \epsilon = 1, 2, \dots, 2\deg_x(u) - 1 \,\} \subseteq E$, and map x to $\lambda_x + e_{N+2\deg_x(u)-1} + \sum_{\epsilon=1}^{\deg_x(u)-1} e_{N+2\epsilon-1}e_{N+2\epsilon}$. We observe that (i) is satisfied by this assignment. The offsets N_x are chosen so that $x \neq y$ implies that $E_x \cap E_y = \varnothing$ and $\bigcup_{x \text{ appears in } u} E_x = \{\, e_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, m \,\}$.

Recall that for $g_1, g_2 \in G$, $\mathrm{dom}(g_1 g_2) = \mathrm{dom}(g_1)\mathrm{dom}(g_2)$ if $s(g_1) \cap s(g_2) = \varnothing$. In particular, since $u \in BSS$ (where the case of u with empty end is just a simplification of the following argument), u is of the form

$$\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \prod_{r=1}^{s} [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{j_{2r}}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}},$$

where for each $r = 1, 2, \dots, t$, $1 \leq \alpha_r \leq p - 1$ and for each $r = 1, 2, \dots, 2s$, $0 \leq \beta_r \leq p$, so $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi(u))$ will be the product of $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi(x_{i_r})^{\alpha_r}))$, $r = 1, 2, \dots, t$, and

$$\mathrm{dom}([\varphi(x_{j_{2r-1}}), \varphi(x_{j_{2r}})]\varphi(x_{j_{2r-1}})^{\beta_{2r-1}}\varphi(x_{j_{2r}})^{\beta_{2r}})$$

for $r = 1, 2, \dots, s$.

We now apply Lemma 3.2 to evaluate the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$, where for convenience, we shall let N_i denote N_x where $x = x_i$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dom}(\varphi(u)) &= \prod_{r=1}^{t}\Big(\alpha_r!\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\alpha_r} e_{N_{i_r}+\epsilon}\Big)\, 2^{lend(u)} \\ &\qquad \prod_{r=1}^{s}\Big(\beta_{2r-1}!\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\beta_{2r-1}+1} e_{N_{j_{2r-1}}+\epsilon}\ \beta_{2r}!\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{2\beta_{2r}+1} e_{N_{j_{2r}}+\epsilon}\Big) \\ &= 2^{lend(u)}\prod_{r=1}^{t}\alpha_r!\prod_{r=1}^{2s}\beta_r!\quad\prod_{\epsilon=1}^{m} e_\epsilon\end{aligned}$$

and so (ii) holds.

Finally, suppose that $v \in BSS$, with $u > v$ and either x_t appears in $beg(v)$ or else x_t appears in $end(v)$ with degree p. If $\varphi(v) = 0$, then $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(v)) = 0$, while $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u)) = m > 0$. Thus we may suppose that $\varphi(v) \neq 0$. If a variable other than x_t appears in $beg(u)$ and in $end(v)$, then $\varphi(v) = 0$, so we may assume that other than x_t, every variable that appears in $beg(u)$ and in v then appears in $beg(v)$. Since conditions (ii) and (iv) of the definition of the Siderov ordering imply that there is a variable that appears in $beg(u)$ and in $end(v)$, we see that $u > v$ must hold by virtue of conditions (i) or (iii) of the definition, or else by conditions (ii) or (iv). We shall prove that it is not possible for $u > v$ to hold by virtue of conditions (ii) or (iv), but first, let us consider the situation when $u > v$ by virtue of conditions (i) or (iii). We now calculate the weight of the dominant part of $\varphi(v)$. The contribution to the weight of the dominant part of $\varphi(v)$ by $x \in X$ that appears in v but not in u is 0. By Lemma 3.2, the contribution to the weight of the dominant part of $\varphi(v)$ by $x \in X$ that appears in both u and v is $\min\{\,2\deg_x(u), 2\deg_x(v)\,\}$ if x appears in $beg(u)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)$), while it is $\min\{\,2\deg_x(u)-1, 2\deg_x(v)-1\,\}$ if x appears in $end(u)$ and $end(v)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)-1$), and it is $\min\{\,2\deg_x(u)-1, 2\deg_x(v)\,\}$ if x appears in $end(u)$ and in $beg(v)$ (so the contribution of x to the dominant part of $\varphi(u)$ has weight $2\deg_x(u)$). Since both conditions (i) and (iii) imply that there is a variable x such that $\deg_x(u) > \deg_x(v) \geq 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u)) > \mathrm{wt}(\varphi(v))$. Now suppose that $u > v$ by virtue of condition (ii) or (iv), either of which implies that there is $x \in X$ such that x appears in $beg(u)$ and in $end(v)$. If $x \neq x_t$, then $\varphi(v) = 0$, so we may suppose that $x = x_t$. Recall that $\deg_{x_t}(v) = p$, while $\deg_{x_t}(u) \leq p-1$. Since condition (iv) only applies when all variables have the same degree in both u and v, we see that we must have $u > v$ by virtue of condition (ii). Thus $\deg(u) = \deg(v)$, but $lend(v) > lend(u)$. Now, every variable (other than x_t) that appears in $beg(u)$ and also appears in v appears in $beg(v)$, and every variable that appears in v also appears in u (otherwise $\varphi(v) = 0$), so the only variables that can appear in $end(v)$ are those in $end(u)$, contradicting the fact that $lend(v) > lend(u)$. This completes the proof that $u > v$ can't occur by virtue of conditions (ii) or (iv). ∎

Definition 4.1

$$S_1 = \{\, [x_1, x_2], x_1^p \,\}^S + \{\, x_1^p \prod_{i=1}^{t} [x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}] x_{2i}^{p-1} x_{2i+1}^{p-1} \mid t \geq 1 \,\}^S.$$

The content of following lemma is known (for example, see Grishin and Tsybulya, [10]).

Lemma 4.1 *Let $u \in SS$ with $lbeg(u) > 0$. If $\deg_x(u) \equiv 0 \ (mod p)$ for every $x \in X$ that appears in the beginning of u, then $u \in S_1 + T^{(3)}$.*

Theorem 4.1 $CP(G) = S_1 + T(G)$.

Proof. Let $U_1 = S_1 + T(G)$. By Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 1.1 (vi) of [3], $U_1 \subseteq CP(G)$. Suppose that $CP(G) - U_1 \neq \varnothing$, and let $f \in CP(G) - U_1$. Recall that f is said to be *essential in its variables* if every variable that appears in any monomial of f appears in every monomial of f. It is well-known that every T-space is generated (as a T-space) by its essential elements, so we may assume that f is essential, and that there is no essential element of $CP(G) - U_1$ with fewer summands. We may further assume that the variables that appear in f are $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$. There exist $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_l \in SS$ and scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l$ such that, modulo $T^{(3)}$, $f = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \alpha_i v_i$. If any v_i had $\deg_x(v_i) \equiv 0 \ (\mathrm{mod}\, p)$ for each $x \in X$ that appears in $beg(v_i)$, then $v_i \in U_1$ by Lemma 4.1. Since this would contradict our choice of f, it follows that for each i, there exists $x \in X$ that appears in $beg(v_i)$ with degree not a multiple of p. Thus, for each i, we may (modulo $T^{(3)}$) write v_i in the form $f_i u_i$, where f_i is a product of the form $\prod_{r=1}^{t} x_{i_r}^{p\delta_r}$, with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots i_t$, and $u_i \in BSS$ such that $\{\, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \,\} = \{\, x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_t} \,\} \cup \{\, x \in X \mid x \text{ appears in } u_i \,\}$. Finally, since $x_i^p - x_i^{qp} \in T(G)$, we may assume that each f_i is a p-polynomial. We remark that $\{\, x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_t} \,\}$ and $\{\, x \in X \mid x \text{ appears in } u_i \,\}$ need not be disjoint. Now, although $v_i \neq v_j$ if $i \neq j$, the same need not be true for the u_i's. Therefore, we shall write $f = \sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i u_i$, where now $u_1 > u_2 > \cdots > u_s$ and for each i, f_i is an essential p-polynomial. Choose an index t such that x_t appears in $beg(u_1)$. Consider any $i > 1$ such that x_t appears in $end(u_i)$ with $\deg_{x_t}(u_i) < p$. By Corollary 2.2 of [3] (where the T-space S referred to there is a subspace of S_1), there exists $u_i' \in BSS$ and $\lambda_i \in k$ such that $\lambda_i \neq 0$, $u_i \equiv \lambda_i u_i' \ (\mathrm{mod}\, U_1)$, and x_t appears in $beg(u_i')$. In the expression for f, replace each such u_i by the corresponding $\lambda_i u_i'$. By the choice of f, no cancellation can occur (although it is possible that $u_i' = u_j'$ for $i \neq j$). Relabelling as necessary, we now have an essential element $\sum_{i=1}^{q} f_i u_i \in CP(G) - U_1$ such that $u_1 > u_2 > \cdots > u_q$, x_t appears in $beg(u_1)$, and for each i, f_i is an essential p-polynomial and either x_t appears in $beg(u_i)$ or else x_t appears in $end(u_i)$ with degree p. Of all such polynomials, let g denote one for which u_1 is least. Write $g = \sum_{x_t \text{ appears in } beg(u_i)} f_i u_i + \sum_{x_t \text{ appears in } end(u_i)} f_i u_i$ and observe that by choice of g, $\sum_{x_t \text{ appears in } beg(u_i)} f_i u_i \neq 0$. If $f_1 \in k$, then $f_1 \neq 0$. Otherwise, $f_1 \notin k$, and then by Corollary 3.1, $f_1 \notin T(G)$.In this case, suppose that the variables that appear in f_1 are $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_d}$. Since for any

$g \in G$, $g^p = proj_k(g)^p$, it follows that there are $\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, \ldots, \lambda_{i_d} \in k$ such that $f_1(\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, \ldots, \lambda_{i_d}) \neq 0$. Note that since f_1 is essential, $\lambda_{i_j} \neq 0$ for every j. For any $i \notin \{\, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d \,\}$, set $\lambda_i = 1$. Note that $\lambda_t \neq 0$. Now apply Proposition 4.1 to u_1, x_t, and our selected λ_i's to obtain a homomorphism $\varphi\colon k_1\langle X\rangle \to G(m)$ such that for $m = 2\deg(u_1) - 2lend(u_1) - 1$ the following hold.

(i) For each index i, $proj_k(\varphi(x_i)) = \lambda_i$.

(ii) $\displaystyle \operatorname{dom}(\varphi(u_1)) = \lambda_t 2^{lend(u_1)} \prod_{x \text{ in } beg(u_1)} \deg_x(u_1)! \prod_{x \text{ in } end(u_1)} (\deg_x(u_1) - 1)! \prod_{i=1}^{m} e_i.$

(iii) For any $v \in BSS$ with $u_1 > v$ and either x_t appears in $beg(v)$ or else x_t appears with degree p in $end(v)$, $m = \operatorname{wt}(\varphi(u_1)) > \operatorname{wt}(\varphi(v))$.

It follows that

$$\varphi(f) = \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{m} e_i + \text{terms of lower weight}$$

where

$$\lambda = f_1(\lambda_{i_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i_d})\lambda_t 2^{lend(u_1)} \prod_{x \text{ in } beg(u_1)} \deg_x(u_1)! \prod_{x \text{ in } end(u_1)} (\deg_x(u_1) - 1)! \neq 0.$$

Since m is odd, we obtain that $\varphi(f)$ has nonzero odd part. But then $\varphi(f) \notin C_G$, which contradicts the fact that $f \in CP(G)$. Thus $CP(G) - U_1 = \varnothing$. ■

References

[1] A. Y. Belov, *Counterexamples to the Specht problem*, Sb. Math., **191**, 2000, 329–340.

[2] P. Z. Chiripov and P. N. Siderov, *On bases for identities of some varieties of associative algebras* (Russian), PLISKA Stud. Math. Bulgar, **2**, 1981, 103-115.

[3] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *The central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary and nonunitary Grassmann algebras*, arXiv:0905.1049.

[4] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *The central polynomials of the finite dimensional unitary and nonunitary Grassmann algebras*, arXiv:0905.1082.

[5] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *Examples of associative algebras for which the T-space of central polynomials is not finitely based*, arXiv:0905.1116.

[6] A. Giambruno and P. Koshlukov, *On the identities of the Grassmann algebras in characteristic $p > 0$*, Isr. J. Math. **122**, 2001, 305–316.

[7] A. V. Grishin, *On the finite-basis property of systems of generalized polynomials*, Izv. Math. USSR, **37**, no. 2, 1991, 243–272.

[8] A. V. Grishin, *On the finite-basis property of abstract T-spaces*, Fund. Prikl. Mat., **1**, 1995, 669–700 (Russian).

[9] A. V. Grishin and V. V. Shchigolev, *T-spaces and their applications*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, **134**, no. 1, 2006, 1799–1878.

[10] A. V. Grishin and L. M. Tsybulya, *On the (p, n)-problem*, Vestn. Samarskogo Gos. Univ. Ser. Mat., **57**, no. 7, 2007, 35–55 (Russian).

[11] A. R. Kemer, *Finite basability of identites of associative algebras*, Algebra Logika, **26**, no. 5, 1987, 597–641.

[12] A. Regev, *Grassmann algebras over finite fields*, Communications in Algebra, **19**, no. 6, 1991, 1829–1849.

[13] W. Specht, *Gezetze in Ringen*, Math. Z., **52**, no. 5, 1950, 557–589.

[14] A. N. Stojanova-Venkova, *Bases of identities of Grassmann algebras*, Serdica, **6**, no. 1, 1980, 63–72.